DRAFT
Meeting Minutes
DEFT-NoName Coordination Team (DNCT)
October 6, 1998
1:00pm to 5:00pm

Participants
Jim White, Pete Chadwick, Bruce Herbold, Serge Birk, Pete Rhoads, BJ Miller, Dave Fullerton, Dave Briggs, George Barnes, Mike Ford, Curtis Creel, Peter Louie, Grace Chan, Russ Brown, Tom Cannon, Ron Ott, Gary Bardini, Ed Winkler(phone), Art Hinojosa(phone),

Agenda:
i. Ron's report from Mngt.
ii. Pete C. presentation of DNCT #1 (example scenario for Mngt)
iii. Bruce H. presentation of various scenario options.
iv. Curtis Creel suggested scenario.
v. BJ Miller presentation of process of developing scenarios.

Action Items
1. Example scenario to Mngt by Thursday.
2. Pete Chadwick will revise DNCT #1 per suggestions to make it a balanced scenario.
3. Curtis Creel will expand and build upon his scenario with the help of Bruce Herbold and Jim White.
4. Ron will present a progress report to Mngt, relating: three broad categories of scenarios; asking them about base case; telling them how we will evaluate scenarios and present tradeoffs. Also we will develop for their review the form and substance of the process, scenarios, and evaluation by 24th.
5. Ron will get facilitator for meetings.
6. Tom Cannon and Russ Brown will help Bruce evaluate when we get salvage hits and what may be related to those hits. This will help define triggers other than the salvage itself. Will present to DEFT.

Highlights
I. Relaxing E/I's in Nov-Jan is a primary means of getting more water. Could adjust E/I's up or down from the Accord in real time using criteria such as previous water year type, present storage level or forecasts, and real-time monitoring. Majority agreed that present E/I restrictions of Accord could stand, with allowances to adjust either way based on real-time conditions and adjustments developed under adaptive management in Stage 1.
II. Relaxing E/I's in Feb-Mar of dry years also provides important dry year water.
III. Consensus of DNCT #1: More water supply is needed (e.g. more storage) to balance the environmental protections we want in our scenario (Accord + AFRP), unless we allocate

all new water supply (160-260 TAF) in DNCT #1 to Ag/urban, but even then it does not show well for water supply.

IV. Four scenarios types were described: (1) use existing Accord standards with strict accounting using relaxation of standards with triggers; (2) drop standards for total flexible operations based on triggers; (3) more stringent standards with relaxation based on triggers; and (4) hybrid of first three. **We could show one of each to Mngt.**

V. Suggestions included presenting a revised DNCT #1 or three scenarios with a range of options. We could give them examples of each of the scenario types we have described.

VI. We should prioritize new env actions (including AFRP, Accord fixes, and new species concerns) and have new water supply tools to come online as env actions come on line and make hits to water supply. At beginning of Stage 1 we should have new water supply and env benefits, then add to both through Stage 1. We should develop fish list and matching water supply to make up for hit. Water supply tools should include three types: (1) changing requirements (e.g., standards); (2) changing demands (e.g., conservation, water transfers); and (3) adding storage.

Ron's Introduction and Instructions

- Sample scenario to Mngt Thursday.
- DNCT steering committee met yesterday to put together some strawman scenarios
- Need to put to scenarios that show various tradeoffs.
- Scenarios need not meet all of our criteria
- Mngt wants to make tradeoffs so they need cost/benefits for env and water supply for the various scenarios. Tradeoffs must be packaged in the array of scenarios.

Pete C. summarized his handout on DNCT #1

Comments:

1. Relaxing E/I's in Nov-Jan in dry and critical years should be revised because you don't know what kind of year you have that early in the water year. Make it a condition of the previous water year or trigger on storage level.
2. B.J. stated that Ag/Urban criteria as "Day 1 of Stage 1 provides more water supply than Accord."
3. Several suggested with general consensus that the "out of the box" scenario should include more protection for environment and water supply, and be reasonable. Others felt the first scenario example should include a range of issues that we have dealt with (e.g. sharing water supply).
4. The larger pumping capacity of ISDP would sit idle in Nov-Jan period under these low E/I's. The existing E/I's are restrictive. These are our only surplus water months. Over one-half present yield comes from unstored flow that arrives in the Delta in winter. This export of unstored flow will be constrained by low E/I ratios.
5. Water supply increase from DNCT #1 is only about 160-260 TAF. Some of benefits of ISDP may be lost with ESA restrictions.
6. AFRP features included: VAMP is included but I Street flows are not.
7. Dave F. suggested to simply leave Accord E/Is for Nov-Jan and allow adjustments either

way under real-time management. Keep it simple. Others suggested three options for E/Is: (1) make them more stringent, (2) don't change, or (3) eliminate and flex operate.

8. Pete C. suggested that scenarios should include specific changes to Accord standards such as E/I ratios. Bruce H. reiterated that he does not want to negotiate using E/I's.
9. Scenarios should have a variety of water supply benefits.
10. George stated that we will need much more water supply if we include AFRP actions above the Accord in our scenario.
11. Sharing of new water supply is negotiable and could be variable. If 100 % of the 160-260 TAF in this scenario is allocated to Ag/urban, then AFRP debits would be covered.
12. Pete R. would accept this if there were more storage and less sharing of new supply with env. The water supply hit would then be at least minimized.
13. Others were concerned about the potential affect of new storage on the env.
14. Intertie should be included because it provides some additional ability to export water at times when its feasible.
15. BJ stated that DNCT does not have enough water supply on Day 1 of Stage 1. New facilities don't come until well into Stage 1. Concerned about how we match up water supply with immediate env protection we have in mind in DNCT #1.
16. Consensus that dropping third bullet and adding all the new water supply specified to go to Ag/urban - would provide a balanced scenario.

Bruce H. presentation - summary of his Oct 5 Scenario Memo

- range of scenarios and themes
- operational features: (1) strict accounting; (2) non-strict accounting; (3) new strict baseline with relaxation for water supply (previously advocated by Mike T.); and (4) hybrids of 1-3.
- flexibility provides less env assurance: its a risk.

Comments:

17. Ed W. suggested a scenario using feature # 1 with two fronts: (1) relaxing standards when allowable, allocating water obtained from relaxation to env and water supply, and (2) adding env storage. There would be a lot of opportunities to relax standards and store new water.
18. Scenario DNCT #1 is really a type 4 (hybrid).
19. It will be hard to get support for a type 2 - no specifics or assurances to env or water supply.
20. Need a balanced approach to show all sides are getting what they need.
21. BJ suggested we consider four variable features in the scenarios: (1) differing degrees of flex operations with fish triggers and flexible standards; (2) differing standards; (3) differing water supply facilities; and (4) differing means of sharing new water supply. There are many ways to mix these four options and providing a balanced scenario. How should we lay out these options for Mngt? Don't see the need to jump to end state as yet.

Curtis Creel Scenario

- Existing Accord standards
- Water supply at current level.
- Cover Upstream AFRP needs.
- Apply additional flexibility
- Share new water
- Limiting factor is available storage - need more.
- JPOD covers about 65% of Upstream AFRP needs.
- Prioritize needs such as Upstream AFRP
- Implement as tools (e.g., new storage) becomes available.
- Hardwire new standards as tools are added.

Comments:

22. Show priorities of actions and tools to provide water.
23. Show tradeoffs of tools.
24. Accord + AFRP = ISDP+JPOD+intertie+other tools suggested (other present storage such as Kern and ground water).
25. Any new hits should be matched as they come with new water supply.
26. New storage is critical if we want more env protections.
27. NoName looked at wide list of options immediately available at beginning of Stage 1, but few provide more dry year water supply.
28. Develop list of priorities for env actions - then match with new water supply tools as action is needed.
29. Bruce stated that they have a long list of Accord failings and new species to cover - these needs should be part of new scenario - a new list of actions needed - to be matched with new water supply resources.
30. Dave F. suggested three approaches to getting new env protections: (1) new standards; (2) devise triggers to allow changes to standards; and (3) hard wire standards; or combinations of the three. He recommends three new - pure - scenarios that vary in the approach or combinations of the three approaches.
31. Approach 2 needs more objective and clearer criteria.
32. BJ related that there are three things we can do to add to water supply:
    (1) change requirements (standards, conveyance restrictions, etc.)
    (2) change demands (water transfers, conservation, etc)
    (3) add storage
33. Curtis will expand and build upon his scenario with the help of Bruce and Jim.
34. Need to change where water supply comes from in dry years.
35. NoName can provide list of other water supply sources (Semi-tropic, Kern, Madera).
36. Some of these are in Common Program for water supply already. Some are identified for Stage 1.
37. Reducing restrictions on water transfers could be included as water supply source.
38. Avoid mentioning mitigation for the AFRP actions.

BJ Miller Presentation of Process for Making Scenarios

- Enter the process from various points - ways of reducing salvage impacts; export reductions; storage options.

Mortality Reduction (variable by species, life stage, etc.)	Water Supply Impact	Water Supply Targets			New Water		
		less than Accord	equal to Accord	more than Accord	Variable Operations (E/I, VAMP, X2, export constraints, ISDP, etc.)	New Storage (Day1-Stage1, in Stage 1, and later)	Other e.g. transfers
25%	X						
50%	XX						
75%	XXX						
90%	XXXX						
Sharing Water Option		x	x	x			

Comments:

39. We should take table to Mngt to get guidance on how much leeway we have in some of the options. Also ask them if there is something missing in our table.
40. The table may be overly simplistic, but that is what management wants.
41. We could make tables for critical and average water year types.
42. Bruce is concerned that putting relaxation of VAMP and X2 on our options list could make Mngt upset.
43. Pete C. is concerned about using salvage reduction as our differentiating factors among scenarios in table. He is concerned about how to reach the goals (e.g., 25%). BJ related that we could use other features or objectives in first column. Ron suggested that may come under the subject of scenario evaluation.
44. We don't need specific restriction, only what we would consider under adaptive management in Stage 1.
45. Given our time constraints, we should not be locked into a Common Program or CALFED recommended Stage 1 configuration.
46. We can add our other things to protect fish to Column 1 of table.

Ron summarized what to present to management

- progress report
- three broad categories of approach

D-015212

- ask them what our base case is to start from
- evaluation parameters for water supply and env.
- tell them how we will evaluate these scenarios
- tell them what the tradeoffs are
- Do we need a facilitor? Yes.

Other suggestions:

- Bruce stated that we need a description on when species are getting hit (salvage) and what is possibly causing hit. For example: are salmon fry only salvaged when flows are above X? Tom C. stated that he and Russ would be helping Bruce on this. Triggers would be developed for species, race, and life stage, and for wet and dry years, etc.
- Jim W. reminded that we need to separate salmon races.
- BJ reminded that we should also consider egg and larval fish that do not show up in salvage. Also effects of predation in CCF.

Next Meeting
Tuesday, October 13th
9:30-12:30
Room #715